

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/643,085	08/19/2003	Ricardo San Martin	LOPEZ-4	3063	
23599	7590 . 12/06/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400			WILKINS III, HARRY D		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ARLINGTON	, VA 22201		1742		

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<u> </u>			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/643,085	SAN MARTIN ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Harry D. Wilkins, III	1742	
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we use to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to the second will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the second ABANDON to the second to the secon	ON.  imely filed  m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.		
3)[	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pr	rosecution as to the merits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			
Applicat	ion Papers			
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>19 August 2003</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	).
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage	
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) ter No(s)/Mail Date 8/19/03.	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5] Notice of Informal 6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/643,085 Page 2

Art Unit: 1742

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Objections

1. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim does not end with a period. Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bultman et al (US 4,484,990) in view of Niwase (JP 09-227345) with support from Nord et al (for claims 3 and 7).

Bultman et al teach (see abstract) a method for inhibiting acid misting in copper electrowinning comprising adding a surfactant to the electrolyte from which copper is electrowon.

Bultman et al fail to teach that the surfactant added was a soluble surfactant comprising an extract from the Quillaja saponaria Molina tree.

However, Niwase teaches (see English abstract) that extracts from the *Quillaja* saponaria Molina tree had excellent surfactant properties.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the surfactant extract from the *Quillaja saponaria* Molina tree as suggested by

Application/Control Number: 10/643,085

Art Unit: 1742

Niwase in the copper electrowinning electrolyte of Bultman et al because Niwase teach that the extracts had excellent surfactant properties.

Regarding claim 2, Niwase teaches (see English abstract) that the extract was composed of a triterpenoid-based saponin.

Regarding claim 3, Niwase fails to teach that structure of the triterpenoid-based saponin. However, Nord et al teach (see pages 199-200) that the extract from the bark of the *Quillaja saponaria* Molina tree included a heterogenous mixture of triterpenoid-based saponins, having a triterpenic core (see figure1) with sugar chains (R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup>) at the 3 and 28 positions. The Therefore, the extract taught by Niwase is considered to inherently posses the claimed composition/structure.

Regarding claims 4-6, Bultman et al teach (see col. 9, lines 45-58) using surfactant concentrations of 1-200 ppm. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used similar concentrations with the surfactant of Niwase. The surfactant

Regarding claim 7, the structure of claim 7 is identical to the structure disclosed by Nord et al in figure 1, with a few exceptions. R¹ of Nord et al corresponds to the trisaccharide present at the left hand side of the structure. However, Nord et al teach (see caption of figure 1) that R¹ could be a branched trisaccharide. R⁴ of claim 7, corresponds to R⁴ of Nord et al. R⁴' of claim 7 corresponds to R³ of Nord et al. The R² structure of Nord et al, an oligosaccharide, corresponds to the structure of the molecule below the "X" on the lower right portion of the structure in claim 7.

Application/Control Number: 10/643,085

Art Unit: 1742

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry D. Wilkins, III whose telephone number is 571-272-1251. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Harry D Wilkins, III

Examiner Art Unit 1742

hdw